New Results on Stability of Singular Stochastic Markov Jump Systems with State-Dependent Noise

Yong Zhao [1,2] , Weihai Zhang [1,*]

[1] College of Electrical Engineering and Automation,
Shandong University of Science and Technology, Qingdao 266590, China

[2] College of Mathematics and Systems Science,
Shandong University of Science and Technology,Qingdao 266590, China

arXiv:1509.01102v1 [math.OC] 3 Sep 2015

Abstract- This paper aims to develop the stability theory for singular stochastic Markov jump systems with state-dependent noise, including both continuous- and discrete-time cases. The sufficient conditions for the existence and uniqueness of a solution to the system equation are provided. Some new and fundamental concepts such as non-impulsiveness and mean square admissibility are introduced, which are different from those of other existing works. By making use of the $\mathcal{H}$-representation technique and the pseudo inverse E^+ of a singular matrix E, sufficient conditions ensuring the system to be mean square admissible are established in terms of strict linear matrix inequalities, which can be regarded as extensions of the corresponding results of deterministic singular systems and normal stochastic systems. Practical examples are given to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approaches.

Index Terms- Singular stochastic systems; stability; $\mathcal{H}$-representation; matrix inequalities.

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past years, a great deal of attention has been paid to singular systems because of its extensive applications to many practical problems, such as electric circuits [1], economics [2-3], aircraft modeling [4], network theory [5-6], robotics [7] and so on. To date, many

* Corresponding author. E-mail address: w_hzhang@163.com

significant notions and results based on state-space systems, for instance, stability analysis [8-12], robust control [9-13], H_∞ control [12, 14], H_∞ filtering [12, 15], H_2/H_∞ control [16], have been successfully extended to singular systems.

On the other hand, in recent years, there have been increasing interest in the singular hybrid system driven by Markov jump parameters as

$$E\dot{x}(t) = A(r(t))x(t), x_0 \in R^n. \tag{1}$$

This is because system (1) can be used to model systems with structure change resulting of some inner discrete event such as component failures or repairs, abrupt environmental disturbances [17-18]. More efforts have been done on stability analysis related to system (1), and a variety of interesting results have been reported, we refer the reader to [17-22] and the references therein.

Nevertheless, it is noted that the system is often perturbed by various types of environment noises in many branches of science and industry [23-27]. If we take the environment noises into account, system (1) becomes a singular stochastic differential equation with Markov jump parameters, which can be represented as:

$$Edx(t) = A(r_t)x(t)dt + C(r_t)x(t)dw(t), \tag{2}$$

where $w(t)$ is one-dimensional, standard Wiener process. Such systems are much more advanced and realistic, which possess all the characteristics of singular systems, Itô equation, as well as hybrid systems. It should be pointed out that, so far, only few works were done on this class of systems as a result of the influence of the diffusion term. In fact, there are some difficulties in generalizing the results of deterministic singular systems to singular Itô systems. For instance, how do we provide the condition for the existence and uniqueness of the solution to the system equation? how do we introduce the non-impulsiveness and admissibility of system (2)? For the cases of system (2) with or without Markov jump parameters, some articles either assumed that the solution of the system equation existed [28] or directly considered that the regularity and non-impulsiveness of system (1) were the same as system (2) [29-30], which completely ignored the crucial action of the diffusion term $C(i)$. Also, as pointed out by [31], the application of Itô formula to system (2) without Markov jump parameters was improper [28-29]. Recently, for system (2) in the absence of Markov jump parameters, [32] laid a solid foundation for the further study of this topic as

Itô formula was exactly applied to such systems; [33] further investigated the observer-based controller design by using a sequential design technique. In [34], based on the results of the singular Markov jump system (1), a sufficient condition for the mean square admissibility of system (2) was given in the form of non-strict linear matrix inequalities. This may cause a big trouble in checking the conditions numerically. Base on the above analysis, it can be found that, up to now, the problem of stability analysis for continuous-time singular stochastic Markov jump systems with state-dependent noise has not been fully investigated, even for the discrete-time case, which motivates us to do this study.

In this paper, we are concerned with the problem of stability analysis for singular stochastic Markov jump systems with state-dependent noise including the continuous- and discrete-time cases. Conditions for the existence and uniqueness of the solution to the system equation are given. The new definitions for non-impulsiveness and mean square admissibility of systems considered are introduced, which are different from those in existing works [28-35]. An equivalent conversion of singular stochastic Markov jump systems with state-dependent noise into standard and deterministic singular systems is obtained by using the $\mathcal{H}$-representation technique, then the sufficient condition for system considered to be mean square admissible is presented in strict LMI, which is less conservative than that in [34]. Furthermore, with the help of the the pseudo inverse E^+ of the singular matrix E, new conditions for the mean square admissibility of the continuous- and discrete-time singular stochastic system with state-dependent noise are formulated as strict LMI. The results obtained can be viewed as extensions of the corresponding results on stability of deterministic singular systems and normal stochastic systems. Finally, illustrative examples are given to show the effectiveness of the proposed results.

Notations: R^n: space of all n- dimensional real vectors with usual 2-norm $\|\cdot\|$; $R^{m\times n}$: space of all $m\times n$ real matrices; S_n: set of all $n\times n$ symmetric matrices; S_n^N: set of $X=(X(1),\cdots,X(N))$ with $X(i)\in S_n, i=1,\cdots,N$; $A>0$(resp.$A<0$): A is a real symmetric positive definite (resp. negative definite) matrix; A^T: the transpose of A; $vec(\cdot)$: the row stacking operator; $A\otimes B$: the Kronecker product of two matrices A and B; E^+: the Moore-Penrose pseudo inverse of the matrix E; $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$: the expectation operator; I_n: the $n\times n$ identity matrix. $R(A)$: the rank of A.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Let us consider the following continuous-time singular stochastic Itô's system with Markov jump parameters:

$$\begin{cases} Edx(t) = A(r_t)x(t)dt + C(r_t)x(t)dw(t), \\ Ex(0) = x_0 \in R^n, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

where E is a constant $n \times n$-dimensional matrix with $rank(E) = r \leq n$; $x(t) \in R^n$ is the system state vector, $x_0 \in R^n$ is the initial condition; $w(t)$ is one-dimensional, standard Wiener process that is defined on the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathcal{P})$ with a filtering $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{\{t\geq 0\}}$; $\{r_t, t \geq 0\}$ is a right continuous homogeneous Markov chain taking values in a finite state space $S = \{1, \cdots, N\}$ with transition probability matrix $\prod = \{\pi_{ij}\}_{N\times N}$ given by

$$\pi_{ij} = p\{r_{t+h} = j | r_t = i\} = \begin{cases} \pi_{ij}h + o(h), i \neq j, \\ 1 + \pi_{ii}h + o(h), i = j, \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where $h > 0$, $\lim_{h\to 0} o(h)/h = 0$, and $\pi_{ij} \geq 0 (i \neq j)$ represents the transition rate from i to j, which satisfies $\pi_{ii} = -\sum_{j\neq i} \pi_{ij}$.

For the sake of discussion, we introduce two operators $\phi: S_n^N \to R^{n^2N}$ and $\psi: S_n^N \to R^{\frac{n(n+1)N}{2}}$ which are defined as follows:

$$\phi(X) = \begin{bmatrix} vec(X(1)) \\ \cdots \\ vec(X(N)) \end{bmatrix}, \psi(X) = \begin{bmatrix} svec(X(1)) \\ \cdots \\ svec(X(N)) \end{bmatrix}, \forall X = (X(1), \cdots, X(N)) \in S_n^N, \tag{5}$$

where $vec(X(i)) = (x_{11}(i), \cdots, x_{1n}(i), \cdots, x_{n1}(i), \cdots, x_{nn}(i))^T \in R^{n^2}$, $svec(X(i)) = (x_{11}(i), \cdots, x_{1n}(i), x_{22}(i), \cdots, x_{2n}(i), \cdots, x_{n-1,n-1}(i), x_{n-1,n}(i), x_{nn}(i))^T \in R^{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}}$, $x_{ks}(i) (k, s = 1, 2, \cdots, n)$ is the element of $X(i)$. Note that $svec(X(i))$ is derived by deleting the repeated elements of $vec(X(i))$. By Definition 2.1 of [27], the relation between $svec(X(i))$ and $vec(X(i))$ is given via $vec(X(i)) = H_n svec(X(i))$, where H_n is a $n^2 \times \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$-dimensional matrix independent of $X(i)$.

By Lemmas 2.1, 2.3 and 2.4 of [27], the following result can be easily obtained.

Lemma 1: (i) For any $X \in S_n^N$, there is a $n^2N \times \frac{n(n+1)}{2}N$ matrix H_n^N independent of X such that $\phi(X) = H_n^N \psi(X)$, where $H_n^N = diag(H_n, \cdots, H_n)$. Conversely, for any $Y \in R^{n^2N\times\frac{n(n+1)}{2}N}$, there is $X \in S_n^N$ such that $\phi(X) = H_n^N Y$, (ii) $(H_n^N)^T H_n^N$ is nonsingular, i.e., H_n^N has full column rank.

Lemma 2: Let $Z_1, Z_2 \in S_n^N$, if $(H_n^N)^T\phi(Z_1) = (H_n^N)^T\phi(Z_2)$, then $\phi(Z_1) = \phi(Z_2)$.

Proof: By Lemma 1-(i), $\phi(Z_1) = H_n^N\psi(Z_1)$, $\phi(Z_2) = H_n^N\psi(Z_2)$. From $(H_n^N)^T\phi(Z_1) = (H_n^N)^T\phi(Z_2)$, we have

$$(H_n^N)^T H_n^N\psi(Z_1) = (H_n^N)^T H_n^N\psi(Z_2).$$

By Lemma 1-(ii), the above formula yields $\psi(Z_1) = \psi(Z_2)$, which is equivalent to $\phi(Z_1) = \phi(Z_2)$.

The next lemma plays a crucial role in this paper, which guarantees the existence and uniqueness of the solution to system (3).

Lemma 3: If there exist a pair of nonsingular matrices $M(i) \in R^{n\times n}$ and $N(i) \in R^{n\times n}$ for every $i \in S$ such that one of the following conditions is satisfied, then system (3) has a unique solution.

$$\begin{aligned}(i)\qquad & M(i)EN(i) = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1}(i) & 0 \\ 0 & N_{n_2}(i) \end{bmatrix}, M(i)A(i)N(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A}_{11}(i) & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n_2}(i) \end{bmatrix}, \\ & M(i)C(i)N(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C}_{11}(i) & \tilde{C}_{12}(i) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $N_{n_2}(i) \in R^{n_2\times n_2}$ is a nilpotent, $N_{n_2}^h(i) = 0$, $\tilde{A}_{11}(i), \tilde{C}_{11}(i) \in R^{n_1\times n_1}, \tilde{C}_{12}(i) \in R^{n_1\times n_2}, n_1 + n_2 = n$.

$$\begin{aligned}(ii)^{[34]}\qquad & M(i)EN(i) = \begin{bmatrix} I_r(i) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, M(i)A(i)N(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}_{11}(i) & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n-r}(i) \end{bmatrix}, \\ & M(i)C(i)N(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{C}_{11}(i) & \bar{C}_{12}(i) \\ 0 & \bar{C}_{22}(i) \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\bar{A}_{11}(i), \bar{C}_{11} \in R^{r\times r}$, $\bar{C}_{12}(i) \in R^{r\times(n-r)}$, $\bar{C}_{22}(i) \in R^{(n-r)\times(n-r)}$.

Proof: The proof of item (ii) can be found in Lemma 2.2 of [34] . As to (i), let $\xi(t) = N(i)^{-1}x(t) = [\xi_1(t)^T \quad \xi_2(t)^T]^T, \xi_1(t) \in R^{n_1}, \xi_2(t) \in R^{n_2}$, then under condition (i), system (3) is equivalent to

$$d\xi_1(t) = \tilde{A}_{11}(i)\xi_1(t)dt + (\tilde{C}_{11}(i)\xi_1(t) + \tilde{C}_{12}(i)\xi_2(t))dw(t) \tag{8}$$

and

$$N_{n_2}(i)d\xi_2(t) = \xi_2(t)dt. \tag{9}$$

Take the Laplace transform on both sides of (9), we have

$$(sN_{n_2}(i) - I)\xi_2(s) = N_{n_2}(i)\xi_2(0). \tag{10}$$

From (10), we obtain

$$\xi_2(s) = (sN_{n_2}(i) - I)^{-1}N_{n_2}(i)\xi_2(0). \tag{11}$$

The inverse Laplace transform of $\xi_2(s)$ yields

$$\xi_2(t) = -\sum_{i=1}^{h-1} \delta^{i-1}(t)N_{n_2}(i)\xi_2(0), \tag{12}$$

where $L[\delta^i(t)] = s^i$.

After substituting (12) into (8), (8) becomes an ordinary stochastic differential equation. By Theorem 3.8 of [24], the solution of (8) exists and is unique, so does (3).

Remark 1: A new condition for the existence and uniqueness of the solution to system (3) is presented in Lemma 3. When $N_{n_2}(i) = 0$, condition (i) is exactly the same as Remark 2.1-(I) of [34]. When $C(i) = 0$, condition (i) reduces to the corresponding result for the singular Markov jump system (see [15], [17]- [22]).

In what follows, we introduce several concepts which are essential in this paper.

Definition 1: System (3) is said to be impulse free if Lemma 3-(i) with $deg(det(sE - A(i))) = R(E)$ or Lemma 3-(ii) hold for every $i \in S$.

Definition 2: System (3) is said to be asymptotically stable in the mean square if for any initial condition $x_0 \in R^n$, $\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\{\|x(t)\|^2|x_0, r_0\} = 0$.

Definition 3: System (3) is said to be mean square admissible if it has a unique solution and is impulse-free and asymptotically stable in the mean square.

Remark 2: As it is observed that Definition 1 for the non-impulsiveness of singular Markov jump systems with state-dependent noise includes the diffusion term $C(i)$, which is firstly introduced and different from all the existing works ([28]- [35]). Also, it is obvious that the non-impulsiveness of system (3) implies that system (3) has a solution, which coincides with deterministic singular systems; see, e.g., [6] and [12]. In the cases of $C(i) = 0$ and $S = \{1\}$, Definition 1 and Definition 3 degenerate to the corresponding definitions of deterministic singular systems ([5]- [16]).

Parallel to the results of deterministic singular systems on the non-impulsiveness behavior, the following proposition is obtained.

Proposition 1 System (3) is said to be impulse free if one of the following conditions holds.

(i) $deg(det(sE - A(i))) = R(E)$ in (6).

(ii)$N_{n_2}(i) = 0$ in (6).

(iii)$\bar{A}_{22}(i)$ in the following (13) is invertible and $R(E, C(i)) = R(E)$,

$$M(i)EN(i) = \begin{bmatrix} I_r(i) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, M(i)A(i)N(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}_{11}(i) & \bar{A}_{12}(i) \\ \bar{A}_{21}(i) & \bar{A}_{22}(i) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$M(i)C(i)N(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{C}_{11}(i) & \bar{C}_{12}(i) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{13}$$

where $M(i)$ and $N(i)$ are invertible matrices.

Proof: We will prove that conditions (i)-(iii) are equivalent.

$(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$. If (6) holds, then $det(sE - A(i)) = det(sI_{n_1}(i) - \tilde{A}_{11}(i))det(sN_{n_2}(i) - I_{n_2}(i))$. But $deg(det(sE - A(i)) = R(E) = r$ implies $N_{n_2}(i) = 0$ and $n_1 = r$.

$(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$. It is easy to see that $N_{n_2}(i) = 0$ in (6) implies $deg(det(sE - A(i))) = R(E)$.

$(iii) \Rightarrow (i)$. Since $R(E) = r$ and $R(E, C(i)) = R(E)$, it is always possible to choose two nonsingular matrices $M(i)$ and $N(i)$ such that (13) holds. If $\bar{A}_{22}(i)$ is invertible, there are nonsingular matrices $\bar{M}(i)$ and $\bar{N}(i)$ such that

$$\bar{M}(i)E\bar{N}(i) = \begin{bmatrix} I_r(i) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \bar{M}(i)A(i)\bar{N}(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}_{11}(i) - \bar{A}_{12}(i)\bar{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\bar{A}_{21}(i) & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n-r}(i) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\bar{M}(i)C(i)\bar{N}(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{C}_{11}(i) - \bar{C}_{12}(i)\bar{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\bar{A}_{21}(i) & \bar{C}_{12}(i) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{14}$$

Obviously, $deg(det(sE - A(i))) = R(E)$ in (6).

$(i) \Rightarrow (iii)$. By $(i) \Leftrightarrow (ii)$, $N_{n_2}(i) = 0$ in (6) implies $R(E, C(i)) = R(E)$. Furthermore, there are nonsingular matrices $M(i)$ and $N(i)$ such that (13) holds. As a result, $deg(det(sE - A(i))) = deg(det(sI_r(i) - \bar{A}_{11}(i))det(-\bar{A}_{22}(i))$. By $deg(det(sE - A(i)) = R(E)$, we have $det(\bar{A}_{22}(i)) \neq 0$, i.e., $\bar{A}_{22}(i)$ is invertible.

The following lemma will be used later.

Lemma 4 [36]: For any three matrices A, B and C of suitable dimensions, $vec(ABC) = (A \otimes C^T)vec(B)$.

III. Stability of continuous-time systems

In this section, we will focus on studying the stability of system (3) via two different approaches. One is to apply the $\mathcal{H}$-representation technique in [27] to improve the existing

results of [34], and the other one is to establish strict LMI conditions for the stability of system (3).

Theorem 1: System (3) is mean square admissible if the following system

$$\mathcal{E}\psi(\dot{X}(t)) = \mathcal{A}\psi(X(t)) \tag{15}$$

is admissible, where (15) is an $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}N$-dimensional deterministic singular system,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E} = (H_n^N)^T diag(E\otimes E,\cdots,E\otimes E)H_n^N,\\
&\mathcal{A} = (H_n^N)^T[diag(A(1)\otimes E + E\otimes A(1) + C(1)\otimes C(1),\cdots,A(N)\otimes E\\
&+E\otimes A(N) + C(N)\otimes C(N)) + (\Pi\otimes I_{n^2})diag(E\otimes E,\cdots,E\otimes E)]H_n^N,\\
&X_i(t) = \mathbb{E}\{x(t)x(t)^T\chi_{\{r_t=i\}}\}, X(t) = (X_1(t),\cdots,X_N(t)),
\end{aligned}$$

and $x(t)$ is the trajectory of (3).

Proof: For (3), let $X_i(t) = \mathbb{E}\{x(t)x(t)^T\chi_{\{r_t=i\}}\}$, then use the generalized Itô's formula [25], we derive

$$E\dot{X}_i(t)E^T = A(i)X_i(t)E^T + EX_i(t)A(i)^T + C(i)X_i(t)C(i)^T + \sum_{j=1}^{N}\pi_{ij}EX_j(t)E^T. \tag{16}$$

Take $vec(\cdot)$ on both sides of (16), we obtain

$$(E\otimes E)vec(\dot{X}_i(t)) = (A(i)\otimes E + E\otimes A(i) + C(i)\otimes C(i))vec(X_i(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^{N}\pi_{ij}(E\otimes E)vec(X_j(t)). \tag{17}$$

(17) can be equivalently written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&diag(E\otimes E,\cdots,E\otimes E)\phi(\dot{X}(t)) = [diag(A(1)\otimes E + E\otimes A(1) + C(1)\otimes C(1),\cdots,\\
&A(N)\otimes E + E\otimes A(N) + C(N)\otimes C(N)) + (\Pi\otimes I_{n^2})diag(E\otimes E,\cdots,E\otimes E)]\phi(X(t)).
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Premultiply (18) by $(H_n^N)^T$, then by Lemma 1-(i), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(H_n^N)^T diag(E\otimes E,\cdots,E\otimes E)H_n^N\psi(\dot{X}(t)) = (H_n^N)^T[diag(A(1)\otimes E + E\otimes A(1) + C(1)\otimes C(1),\\
&\cdots,A(N)\otimes E + E\otimes A(N) + C(N)\otimes C(N)) + (\Pi\otimes I_{n^2})diag(E\otimes E,\cdots,E\otimes E)]H_n^N\psi(X(t))
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E} = (H_n^N)^T diag(E\otimes E,\cdots,E\otimes E)H_n^N,\\
&\mathcal{A} = (H_n^N)^T[diag(A(1)\otimes E + E\otimes A(1) + C(1)\otimes C(1),\cdots,A(N)\otimes E + E\otimes A(N)\\
&\quad +C(N)\otimes C(N)) + (\Pi\otimes I_{n^2})diag(E\otimes E,\cdots,E\otimes E)]H_n^N,
\end{aligned}$$

(19) is converted into (15). Since

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\psi(X(t))=0\Leftrightarrow\lim_{t\to\infty}\phi(X(t))=0$$
$$\Leftrightarrow\lim_{t\to\infty}X(t)=0\Leftrightarrow\lim_{t\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\{\|x(t)\|^2|x_0,r_0\}=0,$$

if (15) is admissible, then system (3) is mean square admissible . This completes the proof.

Remark 3: It is shown that (18) is a deterministic but not a standard singular system, because $\phi(X(t))$ contains repeated or redundant components. Generally speaking, for such a nonstandard system, some classical criterions do not hold [27], this is why we introduce Lemmas 1-2.

Remark 4: Compared with the equation (9) of [34], singular stochastic systems (3) in this paper is equivalently converted to a deterministic $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}N$-dimensional "standard" singular system (15). In this case, we can directly make use of the existing results of deterministic singular systems such as Theorem 2.2 of [12] to provide the strict LMI condition for the mean square admissibility of singular stochastic system (3).

Corollary 1: System (1) is asymptotically mean square admissible if there exist matrices $\mathcal{P}>0$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ such that the following inequality

$$(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{E}+\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q})^T\mathcal{A}+\mathcal{A}^T(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{E}+\mathcal{S}\mathcal{Q})<0 \tag{20}$$

holds, where $\mathcal{S}$ is any matrix with full column rank and satisfies $\mathcal{E}^T\mathcal{S}=0$.

Remark 5: Theorem 1 tells us that we may make use of the existing results of system (15) to discuss the stability of system (3) provided that both (3) and (15) have solutions. Theorem 1 is not convenient to be used in studying stabilization, H_∞ control and other topics of system (3), which motivates us to develop other methods.

Assumption 1: For every $i\in S$, $R(E,C(i))=R(E)$ holds.

Lemma 5: Consider system (3) with initial state $(x_0,i)\in R^n\times S$. If $V(x(t),t,r_t)=x^T(t)E^TP(r_t)x(t)$ with $E^TP(r_t)=P^T(r_t)E$, then for any $t\geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\{\int_0^t\mathcal{L}V(x(s),s,r_s)ds|r_0=i\}=\mathbb{E}\{x^T(t)E^TP(r_t)x(t)|r_0=i\}-x^T(0)E^TP(i)x(0), \tag{21}$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}V(x(t),t,r_t)=x^T(t)[A^T(r_t)P(r_t)+P^T(r_t)A(r_t)$$
$$+\sum_{j=1}^N\pi_{r_tj}E^TP(j)+C^T(r_t)(E^+)^TE^TP(r_t)E^+C(r_t)]x(t). \tag{22}$$

Proof: By generalized Itô's formula in [25] and Theorem 2 of [32], the above lemma can be verified.

Theorem 2: System (3) is mean square admissible if there exist matrices $P(i)$ for each $i \in S$ such that

$$E^T P(i) = P^T(i)E \geq 0, \tag{23}$$

$$A^T(i)P(i) + P^T(i)A(i) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \pi_{ij} E^T P(j) + C^T(i)(E^+)^T E^T P(i) E^+ C(i) < 0. \tag{24}$$

Proof: (i) First, we will show that system (3) has a solution and is impulse free.

Under Assumption 1, there exist a pair of nonsingular matrices M, N such that

$$MEN = \begin{bmatrix} I_r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, MA(i)N = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}_{11}(i) & \bar{A}_{12}(i) \\ \bar{A}_{21}(i) & \bar{A}_{22}(i) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$MC(i)N = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{C}_{11}(i) & \bar{C}_{12}(i) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{25}$$

where the partitions have the appropriate dimensions. From (23) and (24), we derive

$$A^T(i)P(i) + P^T(i)A(i) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \pi_{ij} E^T P(j) < 0. \tag{26}$$

(23) and (26) show that $(E, A(i))$ is regular, impulse free and $\bar{A}_{22}(i)$ is invertible (see Theorem 10.1 of [12]). Let

$$\bar{M}(i) = \begin{bmatrix} I & -\bar{A}_{12}(i)\bar{A}_{22}^{-1}(i) \\ 0 & \bar{A}_{22}^{-1}(i) \end{bmatrix} M, \ \bar{N}(i) = N \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -\bar{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\bar{A}_{21}(i) & I \end{bmatrix}, \tag{27}$$

we have

$$\bar{M}(i)E\bar{N}(i) = \begin{bmatrix} I_r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ \bar{M}(i)A(i)\bar{N}(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}_{11}(i) - \bar{A}_{12}(i)\bar{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\bar{A}_{21}(i) & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\bar{M}(i)C(i)\bar{N}(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{C}_{11}(i) - \bar{C}_{12}(i)\bar{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\bar{A}_{21}(i) & \bar{C}_{12}(i) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{28}$$

It is shown that (28) satisfies Proposition 1-(ii), so (3) has a solution and is impulse-free.

(ii) Below, we will prove that system (3) is asymptotically stable in the mean square.

Let

$$\bar{N}(i)^{-1}x(t) = [\xi_1(t)^T \quad \xi_2(t)^T]^T, \tag{29}$$

where $\xi_1(t) \in R^r, \xi_2(t) \in R^{n-r}$, then system (3) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} d\xi_1(t) = (\bar{A}_{11}(i) - \bar{A}_{12}(i)\bar{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\bar{A}_{21}(i))\xi_1(t)dt \\ \qquad\quad +(\bar{C}_{11}(i) - \bar{C}_{12}(i)\bar{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\bar{A}_{21}(i))\xi_1(t)dw(t) \\ \xi_2(t) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{30}$$

Let

$$\bar{M}^{-T}(i)P(i)\bar{N}^{-1}(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{P}_{11}(i) & \bar{P}_{12}(i) \\ \bar{P}_{21}(i) & \bar{P}_{22}(i) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{31}$$

(23) and (26) imply $\bar{P}_{11}(i) = \bar{P}_{11}^T(i) > 0, \bar{P}_{12}(i) = 0$. The Lyapunov function candidate is selected as

$$V(x(t), t, r_t) = x^T(t)E^T P(r_t)x(t) = \xi_1^T(t)\bar{P}_{11}(r_t)\xi_1(t). \tag{32}$$

Take the expectation on both sides of (32), we obtain

$$\lambda_{min}(\bar{P}_{11}(r_t))\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(t)\|^2) \leq \mathbb{E}(V(x(t), t, r_t)) \leq \lambda_{max}(\bar{P}_{11}(r_t))\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(t)\|^2). \tag{33}$$

From (22) and (24), there exists a positive constant θ such that

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L}V(x(t), t, r_t)) \leq -\theta\mathbb{E}(\|x(t)\|^2). \tag{34}$$

Using (29), we have

$$\lambda_{min}(\bar{N}^T(r_t)\bar{N}(r_t))\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(t)\|^2) \leq \mathbb{E}(\|x(t)\|^2) \leq \lambda_{max}(\bar{N}^T(r_t)\bar{N}(r_t))\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(t)\|^2). \tag{35}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L}V(x(t), t, r_t)) \leq -\theta\lambda_{min}(\bar{N}^T(r_t)N(r_t))\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(t)\|^2). \tag{36}$$

We define a new function $U(t) = e^{\rho t}V(x(t), t, r_t)$, then

$$dU(t) = \rho e^{\rho t}V(x(t), t, r_t)dt + e^{\rho t}dV(x(t), t, r_t). \tag{37}$$

By the theory of stochastic differential equations, $\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(t)\|^2)$ is continuous and bounded on any finite horizon $[0, t]$, so do $\mathbb{E}(V(x(t), t, r_t))$ and $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L}V(x(t), t, r_t))$ due to (33) and (36). Hence, we can proceed to integrate and take the expectation on both sides of (37), which yields

$$\mathbb{E}(U(t)) = \mathbb{E}(U(0)) + \int_0^t \rho e^{\rho s}\mathbb{E}(V(x(s), s, r_s))ds + \int_0^t e^{\rho s}\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{L}V(x(s), s, r_s))ds. \tag{38}$$

Substitute (33) and (36) into (38), we derive

$$min_{r_t\in S}\{\lambda_{min}\,(\bar{P}_{11}(r_t))\}e^{\rho t}\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(t)\|^2) \le \int_0^t e^{\rho s}\{\rho max_{r_s\in S}\{\lambda_{max}\bar{P}_{11}(r_s)\}\}\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(s)\|^2)ds$$
$$- \int_0^t e^{\rho s}\{\theta min_{r_s\in S}\{\lambda_{min}(N^T(r_s)N(r_s)\}\}\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(s)\|^2)ds + \mathbb{E}(U(0)). \quad (39)$$

Select an appropriate ρ which satisfies $\rho \le \frac{\theta min_{r_t\in S}\{\lambda_{min}(N^T(r_t)N(r_t))\}}{max_{r_t\in S}\{\lambda_{max}\bar{P}_{11}(r_t)\}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(t)\|^2) \le \frac{\mathbb{E}(U(0))}{min_{r_t\in S}\{\lambda_{min}\bar{P}_{11}(r_t)\}}e^{-\rho t} = \frac{\xi_1^T(0)\bar{P}_{11}(r_0)\xi_1(0)}{max_{r_t\in S}\{\lambda_{min}\bar{P}_{11}(r_t)\}}e^{-\rho t}$$
$$\le \frac{max_{r_0\in S}\{\lambda_{max}\bar{P}_{11}(r_0)\}}{min_{r_t\in S}\{\lambda_{min}\bar{P}_{11}(r_t)\}}e^{-\rho t}\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(0)\|^2). \quad (40)$$

Let $\gamma = \frac{max_{r_0\in S}\{\lambda_{max}\bar{P}_{11}(r_0)\}}{min_{r_t\in S}\{\lambda_{min}\bar{P}_{11}(r_t)\}}$, (40) becomes

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(t)\|^2) \le \gamma e^{-\rho t}\mathbb{E}(\|\xi_1(0)\|^2). \quad (41)$$

Take limit on (41), we obtain

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\{\|\xi_1(t)\|^2\} = 0. \quad (42)$$

By Definition 2, (30) is asymptotically stable in mean square sense, so does (3). According to Definition 3, system (3) is mean square admissible.

Note that (23) contains equality constraints, which are usually not satisfied perfectly when solving them via LMI toolbox. To this end, the following theorem provides a sufficient condition for system (3) to be mean square admissible in terms of strict LMIs.

Theorem 3: System (3) is mean square admissible if there exist matrices $P(i) > 0$, $Q(i)$, for each $i \in S$ such that

$$A^T(i)(P(i)E + FQ(i)) + (P(i)E + FQ(i))^T A(i) + \sum_{j=1}^{N}\pi_{ij}E^T P(j)E + C^T(i)(E^+)^T E^T P(i)EE^+C(i) < 0, \quad (43)$$

where $F \in R^{n\times(n-r)}$ is any matrix with full column rank and satisfies $E^T F = 0$.

Proof: Let $\bar{P}(i) = P(i)E + FQ(i)$, it is easy to verify that

$$E^T\bar{P}(i) = \bar{P}^T(i)E = E^T P(i)E \ge 0, \quad (44)$$

$$A^T(i)\bar{P}(i) + \bar{P}^T(i)A(i) + \sum_{j=1}^{N}\pi_{ij}E^T\bar{P}(j) + C^T(i)(E^+)^T E^T\bar{P}(i)E^+C(i) < 0. \quad (45)$$

By Theorem 2, system (3) is mean square admissible.

Remark 6: When $E = I$, obviously, $F = 0$. In this case, Theorem 3 still coincides with the stability theory of [26] on state-space stochastic systems. When $S = \{1\}$, i.e., there is no

Markov jump parameters in system (3), Theorem 2 accords with Theorem 1 of [33]. When $C(i) = 0$, Theorem 3 degenerates to the criterion for the stability of singular Markov jumping systems in [21].

Remark 7: It is noted that, under the assumption $R(E, C(i)) = R(E)$, Theorem 2 provides the sufficient conditions for singular stochastic systems to be mean square admissible. The assumption condition is less conservative than all the previous works (see, e.g. [32]-[35]), where Theorem 6.1 of [35] was based on the assumption that $deg(det(sE - A)) = R(E), det(sE - A) \neq 0$, and $R(E, C(i)) = R(E)$, while Theorem 1 of [33] just omitted $deg(det(sE-A)) = R(E)$. On the other hand, since Theorem 2 includes equality constraints, this may lead to computational problem in testing them. To overcome this difficulty, the sufficient conditions for the mean square admissibility of system (3) is formulated in terms of strict LMI in Theorem 3. The strict LMI conditions obtained are completely different from those in [29], [30], [33]- [35], which are not only easily to be tested by Matlab toolbox but also provide a useful way to investigate other control problems such as state feedback, H_∞ control and H_2/H_∞ control that have not been fully discussed yet.

IV. Stability of discrete-time systems

Consider a class of discrete-time singular stochastic systems with Markov jump parameters:

$$\begin{cases} Ex(k+1) = A(r_k)x(k) + C(r_k)x(k)w(k), \\ x(0) = x_0 \in R^n, \end{cases} \tag{46}$$

where $x(t) \in R^n$ is the system state, $x_0 \in R^n$ is the initial condition; E is a constant $n \times n$-dimensional matrix with $rank(E) = r \leq n$; $w(k) \in R$ is a wide stationary, second-order process, $\mathbb{E}(w(k)) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(w(k)w(s)) = \delta_{ks}$ with δ_{ks} being a Kronecker delta; the parameter r_k represents a discrete-time Markov chain taking values in a finite set $S = \{1, \cdots, N\}$ with transition probabilities $Pr\{r_{k+1} = j | r_k = i\} = \lambda_{ij}$, and the transition probability matrix is given as $\bigwedge = \{\lambda_{ij}\}_{N\times N}$, where $\lambda_{ij} \geq 0$ and satisfies $\sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{ij} = 1$ for any $i \in S$.

To avoid tedious repetition, results for discrete-time systems are only listed without any proof unless necessary.

Lemma 6: If there exist a pair of nonsingular matrices $M(i) \in R^{n\times n}$ and $N(i) \in R^{n\times n}$ for every $i \in S$ such that one of the expressions (6), (7) holds, then (46) has a unique solution.

Parallel to the continuous-time case, the following definitions for discrete-time stochastic singular system (46) are presented.

Definition 4: System (46) is said to be causal if Lemma 3-(i) with $deg(det(sE-A(i))) = R(E)$ or Lemma 3-(ii) holds for every $i \in S$.

Definition 5: System (46) is said to be asymptotically stable in the mean square if it has a unique solution and for any initial condition $x_0 \in R^n$, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\{\|x(k)\|^2|x_0, r_0\} = 0$.

Definition 6: System (46) is said to be mean square admissible if it has a unique solution and is casual and asymptotically stable in the mean square.

Following the similar lines as those presented in Theorem 1, we can obtain the following result readily.

Theorem 4: System (46) is mean square admissible if the following system

$$\mathcal{E}\psi(\dot{X}(k)) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}\psi(X(k)) \tag{47}$$

is admissible, where (47) is an $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}N$-dimensional deterministic singular system,

$$\mathcal{E} = (H_n^N)^T diag(E\otimes E, \cdots, E\otimes E)H_n^N,$$
$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = (H_n^N)^T(\Lambda^T \otimes I_{n^2})diag(A(1)\otimes A(1) + C(1)\otimes C(1), \cdots, A(N)\otimes A(N)$$
$$+C(N)\otimes C(N))H_n^N,$$
$$X_i(k) = \mathbb{E}\{x(k)x(k)^T\chi_{\{r_k=i\}}\}, X(k) = (X_1(k), \cdots, X_N(t)).$$

Now, We present new sufficient conditions for the admissibility of system (46) in the form of LMIs.

Theorem 5: System (46) is mean square admissible if there exist symmetric matrices $P(i) = P^T(i)$ for each $i \in S$ such that

$$E^T P(i)E \geq 0, \tag{48}$$

$$A^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}P(j))A(i) + C^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}P(j))C(i) - E^T P(i)E < 0. \tag{49}$$

Proof: (i) Our first aim is to prove that (46) has a solution and is casual.

Based on Assumption 1, there exist nonsingular matrices M, N such that

$$MEN = \begin{bmatrix} I_r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, MA(i)N = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_{11}(i) & \hat{A}_{12}(i) \\ \hat{A}_{21}(i) & \hat{A}_{22}(i) \end{bmatrix},$$
$$MC(i)N = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{C}_{11}(i) & \hat{C}_{12}(i) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{50}$$

Let

$$M^{-T}P(i)M^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{P}_{11}(i) & \hat{P}_{12}(i) \\ \hat{P}_{12}^T(i) & \hat{P}_{22}(i) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{51}$$

substitute (50) and (51) into (48), (49) respectively, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} E^TP(i)E &= (N^{-T}\begin{bmatrix} I_r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}M^{-T})(M^T\begin{bmatrix} \hat{P}_{11}(i) & \hat{P}_{12}(i) \\ \hat{P}_{12}^T(i) & \hat{P}_{22}(i) \end{bmatrix}M)(M^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} I_r(i) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}N^{-1}) \\ &= N^{-T}\begin{bmatrix} \hat{P}_{11}(i) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}N^{-1} \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &A^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}P(j))A(i) + C^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}P(j))C(i) - E^TP(i)E \\ &= N^{-T}\begin{bmatrix} W_1(i) & W_2(i) \\ W_2^T(i) & W_3(i) \end{bmatrix}N^{-1} < 0, \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(i) &= \hat{A}_{11}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{11}(j))\hat{A}_{11}(i) + \hat{C}_{11}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{11}(j))\hat{C}_{11}(i) + \hat{A}_{21}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{12}^T(j))\hat{A}_{11}(i) \\ &+\hat{A}_{11}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{12}(j))\hat{A}_{21}(i) + \hat{A}_{21}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{22}(j))\hat{A}_{21}(i) - \hat{P}_{11}(i), \\ W_2(i) &= \hat{A}_{11}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{11}(j))\hat{A}_{12}(i) + \hat{C}_{11}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{11}(j))\hat{C}_{12}(i) + \hat{A}_{21}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{12}^T(j))\hat{A}_{12}(i) \\ &+\hat{A}_{11}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{12}(j))\hat{A}_{22}(i) + \hat{A}_{21}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{22}(j))\hat{A}_{22}(i), \\ W_3(i) &= \hat{A}_{12}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{11}(j))\hat{A}_{12}(i) + \hat{C}_{12}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{11}(j))\hat{C}_{12}(i) + \hat{A}_{22}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{12}^T(j))\hat{A}_{12}(i) \\ &+\hat{A}_{12}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{12}(j))\hat{A}_{22}(i) + \hat{A}_{22}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{22}(j))\hat{A}_{22}(i). \end{aligned}$$

(53) implies $W_3(i) < 0$. Furthermore, since $\hat{P}_{11}(j) \geq 0$ for each $j \in S$, we have

$$\hat{A}_{12}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{11}(j))\hat{A}_{12}(i) + \hat{C}_{12}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{11}(j))\hat{C}_{12}(i) \geq 0. \tag{54}$$

Therefore, in $W_3(i)$, it is easy to see that

$$\hat{A}_{22}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{12}^T(j))\hat{A}_{12}(i) + \hat{A}_{12}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{12}(j))\hat{A}_{22}(i) + \hat{A}_{22}^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{22}(j))\hat{A}_{22}(i) < 0. \tag{55}$$

From (55), it follows that $\hat{A}_{22}(i)$ is invertible. By Definition 10.2 of [12], $(E, A(i))$ is regular and casual. Let

$$\hat{N}(i) = N \begin{bmatrix} I_r(i) & 0 \\ -\hat{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\hat{A}_{21}(i) & \hat{A}_{22}^{-1}(i) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{56}$$

we derive

$$ME\hat{N}(i) = \begin{bmatrix} I_r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, MA\hat{N}(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_{11}(i) - \hat{A}_{12}(i)\hat{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\hat{A}_{21}(i) & \hat{A}_{12}(i)\hat{A}_{22}^{-1}(i) \\ 0 & I_{n-r}(i) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$MC(i)\hat{N}(i) = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{C}_{11}(i) - \hat{C}_{12}(i)\hat{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\hat{A}_{21}(i) & \hat{C}_{12}(i)\hat{A}_{22}^{-1}(i) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{57}$$

By Proposition 1-(ii), system (46) has a solution and is casual.

(ii) Now, we are in a position to prove that system (46) is asymptotically stable in mean square sense.

Let

$$x(k) = \hat{N}(i)[\xi_1(k)^T \quad \xi_2(k)^T]^T, \tag{58}$$

where $\xi_1(k) \in R^r, \xi_2(k) \in R^{n-r}$, then system (46) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \xi_1(k+1) = (\hat{A}_{11}(i) - \hat{A}_{12}(i)\hat{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\hat{A}_{21}(i))\xi_1(k) \\ \qquad\qquad +(\hat{C}_{11}(i) - \hat{C}_{12}(i)\hat{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\hat{A}_{21}(i))\xi_1(k)w(k) \\ \xi_2(k) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{59}$$

For simplicity, write

$$\tilde{A}_1(i) = \hat{A}_{11}(i) - \hat{A}_{12}(i)\hat{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\hat{A}_{21}(i), \tilde{C}_1(i) = \hat{C}_{11}(i) - \hat{C}_{12}(i)\hat{A}_{22}^{-1}(i)\hat{A}_{21}(i). \tag{60}$$

Substitute (51) and (57) into (49), we obtain

$$-\hat{P}_{11}(i) + \tilde{A}_1^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{11}(j))\tilde{A}_1(i) + \tilde{C}_1^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{11}(j))\tilde{C}_1(i) < 0. \tag{61}$$

By (52) and (61), it follows that $\hat{P}_{11}(i) > 0$ for every $i \in S$. Define

$$V(x(k), r_k) = x^T(k)E^T P(r_k)Ex(k) = \xi_1^T(k)\hat{P}_{11}(r_k)\xi_1(k) > 0, \tag{62}$$

it can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\{V(\xi_1(k+1), r_{k+1}|\xi_1(k), r_k = i\} - V(\xi_1(k), r_k = i) \\ &= \xi_1^T(k)[-\hat{P}_{11}(i) + \tilde{A}_1^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{11}(j))\tilde{A}_1(i) + \tilde{C}_1^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{ij}\hat{P}_{11}(j))\tilde{C}_1(i)]\xi_1^T(k) \\ &< 0. \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Thus, there exists a positive constant δ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\{V(\xi_1(k+1), r_{k+1}|\xi_1(k), r_k = i\} - V(\xi_1(k), r_k = i) < -\delta\|\xi_1(k)\|^2. \tag{64}$$

On the other hand, from (62), we obtain

$$\lambda_{min}(\hat{P}_{11}(r_k))\|\xi_1(k)\|^2 \leq V(\xi_1(k), r_k) \leq \lambda_{max}(\hat{P}_{11}(r_k))\|\xi_1(k)\|^2. \tag{65}$$

Use (64) and (65), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{V(\xi_1(k+1), r_{k+1}|\xi_1(k), r_k\} < \beta V(\xi_1(k), r_k), \tag{66}$$

where

$$0 < \beta = 1 - min_{r_k \in S}(\frac{\delta}{\lambda_{max}(\hat{P}_{11}(r_k))}) < 1.$$

By the iterative relationship, (66) yields

$$\mathbb{E}\{V(\xi_1(k), r_k|\xi_1(0), r_0\} < \beta^k V(\xi_1(0), r_0). \tag{67}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\{\|\xi_1(k)\|^2|\xi_1(0), r_0\} < \alpha\beta^k\|\xi_1(0)\|^2, \tag{68}$$

where $\alpha = \frac{max_{r_k \in S}\lambda_{max}(\hat{P}_{11}(r_0))}{min_{r_k \in S}\{\lambda_{min}\hat{P}_{11}(r_k)\}}$. Taking the limit on (68), we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\{\|\xi_1(k)\|^2|\xi_1(0), r_0\} = 0. \tag{69}$$

According to Definition 6, (59) is asymptotically stable in mean square sense, and so does system (46). This completes the proof.

The following Theorem provides a strict LMI condition for system (46) to be mean square admissible.

Theorem 6: System (46) is mean square admissible if there exist positive definite matrices $P(i) > 0$, $i \in S$ and a symmetric nonsingular matrix Q, such that the following LMI

$$A^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{ij}P(j) + FQF^T)A(i) + C^T(i)(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{ij}P(j) + FQF^T)C(i) - E^T P(i)E < 0, \tag{70}$$

holds, where F is a matrix with full column rank and satisfies $E^T F = 0$.

Proof: Let $X(i) = P(i) + FQF^T$ in (70), by Theorem 5, Theorem 6 can be verified.

V. PRACTICAL EXAMPLES

In this section, two illustrative examples related to practical problems are proposed to demonstrate the effectiveness of our presented approaches.

Example 1: Consider the modeling of oil catalytic cracking in practical engineering ([6], [31]), which is an extremely complicated process when administration is included and its simplified form is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1(t) &= R_{11}x_1(t) + R_{12}x_2(t) + B_1u(t) + C_1f, \\ 0 &= R_{21}x_1(t) + R_{22}x_2(t) + B_2u(t) + C_2f, \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

where $x_1(t)$ is a vector to be regulated such as regenerate temperature, valve position or blower capacity. $x_2(t)$ is the vector reflecting business benefits, administration or policy, etc.. $u(t)$ is the regulation value and f represents extra disturbances. For convenience, we consider the case of $u(t) = 0,\ f = 0$, then (71) can be expressed as

$$E\dot{x}(t) = Rx(t), \tag{72}$$

where $x(t) = [x_1(t)^T \quad x_2(t)^T]^T$ is a state vector,

$$E = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},\ R = \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & R_{12} \\ R_{21} & R_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is obvious that (72) is a deterministic singular system. However, it might happen that R is subject to some random environmental effects ([23]- [25]) such as $R = A + C\text{“}noise\text{”}$. In this case, (72) becomes

$$\frac{Edx(t)}{dt} = Ax(t) + Cx(t)\text{“}noise\text{”}. \tag{73}$$

It turns out that a reasonable mathematical interpretation for the “noise” term is the so-called white noise $\dot{w}(t)$. By (73), we have

$$Edx(t) = Ax(t)dt + Cx(t)dw(t). \tag{74}$$

In (74), A is called the drift matrix reflecting the effect on the system state, while C is called the diffusion matrix reflecting the noise intensity. On the other hand, it has been recognized that, in many practical situations, the coefficient matrices are not constant but

random processes which can be modeled by a Markov chain ([18], [25]). Therefore, we obtain the following new equation

$$Edx(t) = A(r_t)x(t)dt + C(r_t)x(t)dw(t). \tag{75}$$

For (75), if we take the following data:

$$E = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, A(1) = \begin{bmatrix} -0.5 & 0.7 \\ 0.4 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}, A(2) = \begin{bmatrix} -0.2 & 0.1 \\ 0.3 & 0.2 \end{bmatrix}, C(1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4 & 0.2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$
$$C(2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.3 & 0.2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, F = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T, \Pi = \begin{bmatrix} -0.6 & 0.6 \\ 0.5 & -0.5 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{76}$$

then the solutions of LMIs (43) are given as follows:

$$P(1) = \begin{bmatrix} 1.7492 & -0.0000 \\ -0.0000 & 1.9498 \end{bmatrix}, P(2) = \begin{bmatrix} 2.4364 & 0.0000 \\ 0.0000 & 1.9498 \end{bmatrix},$$
$$Q(1) = \begin{bmatrix} -1.1149 & -2.0192 \end{bmatrix}, Q(2) = \begin{bmatrix} -0.7417 & -2.8348 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{77}$$

By Theorem 3, system (3) is mean square admissible.

Example 2: Consider a dynamic Leontief model of a multisector economy without final demands ([2], [3], [38])

$$x(k) = Gx(k) + E[x(k+1) - x(k)] \tag{78}$$

where $x(k)$ is the vector of output levels, G is the Leontief input-output matrix, and E is the capital coefficient matrix. In economics, capital coefficient matrix E is usually singular ([2], [3], [38], [39]). However, the above practical system are often perturbed by some environmental noise([24], [25]). Suppose that the parameter G is not completely known which is stochastically perturbed with $G \to G + Cw(k)$, where $w(k) \in R$ is a wide stationary, second-order process and C represents the intensity of the noise. Then this environmentally perturbed system may be described as

$$Ex(k+1) = (I - G + E)x(k) + Cx(k)w(k). \tag{79}$$

Let us further consider another type of random fluctuation. Suppose that the Leontief input-output matrix G is a Markov jump process which can be modeled by a Markov chain ([18],

[37], [39]), and the capital coefficient matrix is invariant. As a result, the Leontief model is generalized to a new model

$$Ex(k+1) = (I - G(r_t) + E)x(k) + C(r_t)x(k)w(k). \tag{80}$$

Let $A(r_t) = I - G(r_t) + E$, then (80) is exactly the same as (46). If for some concrete economical problem, the following data are taken in (80):

$$E = \begin{bmatrix} 0.2 & 0.3 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, G(1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 & 0.2 \\ 0.3 & 0.1 \end{bmatrix}, G(2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.2 & 0.2 \\ 0.4 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}, C(1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4 & -0.2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$
$$C(2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.3 & -0.1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, F = \begin{bmatrix} -0.3 & 0.2 \end{bmatrix}^T, \Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4 & 0.6 \\ 0.3 & 0.7 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{81}$$

then the solutions of LMIs (70) are given as follows:

$$P(1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.9548 & -0.4239 \\ -0.4239 & 0.3913 \end{bmatrix}, P(2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6976 & -0.3940 \\ -0.3940 & 0.3284 \end{bmatrix}, Q = -11.7901. \tag{82}$$

Therefore, by Theorem 6, system (46) is mean square admissible.

VI. Conclusion

This paper has investigated the mean square admissibility of continuous- and discrete-time singular stochastic Markov jump systems with state-dependent noise. Conditions for the existence and uniqueness of the solution to the systems considered have been provided. In particular, new sufficient conditions for continuous- and discrete-time singular hybrid systems with state-dependent noise to be mean square admissible have been proposed in terms of strict LMIs.

References

[1] Rosdnbrock HH. Structural properties of linear dynamical systems. *International Journal of Control* 1974; **20**(2): 191-202.

[2] Luenberger DG, Arbel A. Singular dynamic Leontief systems. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* 1977; 991-995.

[3] Luenberger DG. Dynamic equations in descriptor form. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 1977; **22**(3): 312-321.

[4] Ardema MD. *Singular perturbations in systems and control*. USA: NASA, TM-62, 1983.

[5] Lewis FL. A survey of linear singular systems. *Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing* 1986; **5**(1): 3-36.

[6] Dai L. *Singular Control Systems*. Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences. Springer: New York, 1989.

[7] Ailon A. On the design of output feedback for finite and infinite pole assignment in singular systems with application to the control problem of constrained robots. *Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing* 1994; **13**(5): 525-544.

[8] Xu S, Yang C. Stabilization of discrete-time singular systems: a matrix inequalities approach. *Automatica* 1999; **35**(9):1613-1617.

[9] Shi P, Boukas EK, Agarwal RK. Robust control of singular continuous-time systems with delays and uncertainties. *Decision and Control, Proceedings of the 39th IEEE Conference on* 2000; **2**:1515-1520.

[10] Xu S, Van Dooren P, Stefen R, Lam J. Robust stability and stabilization for singular systems with state delay and parameter uncertainty. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 2002; **47**(7):1122-1128.

[11] Xu S, Lam J. Robust stability and stabilization of discrete-time singular systems: an equivalent characterization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 2004; **49**(4): 568-574.

[12] Xu S, Lam J. *Robust Control and Filtering of Singular Systems*. Springer: Berlin, 2006.

[13] Fang C, Lee L, Chang F. Robust control analysis and design for discrete-time singular systems. *Automatica* 1994; **30**(11): 1741-1750.

[14] Masubuchi I, Kamitane Y, Ohara A, Suda N. H_∞ control for descriptor systems: a matrix inequalities approach. *Automatica* 1997; **3**(4): 669-673.

[15] Xu S, Zou Y. H_∞ filtering for singular systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 2003; **48**(12): 2217-2222.

[16] Zhang L, Huang B, Lam J. LMI synthesis of H_2 and mixed H_2/H_∞ controllers for singular systems. *Circuits and Systems II: Analog and Digital Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on* 2003; **50**(9): 615-626.

[17] Boukas EK, Xu S, Lam J. On stability and stabilizability of singular stochastic systems with delays. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 2005; **127**(2): 249-262.

[18] Boukas EK. *Control of singular systems with random abrupt changes*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.

[19] Xia Y, Zhang J, Boukas EK. Control for discrete singular hybrid systems. *Automatica* 2008; **44**(10): 2635-2641.

[20] Boukas EK. On stability and stabilisation of continuous-time singular Markovian switching systems. *IET Control Theory and Applications* 2008; **2**(10): 884-894.

[21] Xia Y, Boukas EK, Shi P, Zhang J. Stability and stabilization of continuous-time singular hybrid systems. *Automatica* 2009; **45**(6): 1504-1509.

[22] Ma S, Boukas EK, Chinniah Y. Stability and stabilization of discrete-time singular Markov jump systems with time-varying delay. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control* 2010; **20**(5): 531-543.

[23] Skorohod AV. *Asymptotic Methods in the Theory of Stochastic Differential Equations*. American Mathematical Society Providence: RI, 1989.

[24] Oksendal B.*Stochastic differential equations: an introduction with application*. Springer: New York, 1998.

[25] Mao X, Yuan C. *Stochastic differential equations with Markovian switching*. London: Imperial College Press, 2006.

[26] Zhang W, Zhang H, Chen B S. Generalized Lyapunov equation approach to state-dependent stochastic stabilization/detectability criterion. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 2008; **53**(7): 1630-1642.

[27] Zhang W, Chen B S. $\mathcal{H}$-representation and applications to generalized Lyapunov equations and linear stochastic systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 2012; **57**(12): 3009-3022.

[28] Boukas EK. Stabilization of stochastic singular nonlinear hybrid systems. *Nonlinear Analysis* 2006; **64**(2): 217-228.

[29] Zhang Q, Xing S. Stability analysis and optimal control of stochastic singular systems. *Optimization Letters* 2014; **8**(6): 1905-1920.

[30] Han C, Wu L, Shi P, Zheng Q. Passivity and passification of T-S fuzzy descriptor systems with stochastic perturbation and time delay. *IET Control Theory and Applications* 2013; **7**(13): 1711-1724.

[31] Zhang W, Zhao, Y, Sheng L. Some remarks on stability of stochastic singular systems with state-dependent noise. *Automatica* 2015; **51**: 273-277.

[32] Ho D, Shi X, Wang Z, Gao Z. Filtering for a class of stochastic descriptor systems. *In Proceedings of the International Conference on Dynamics of Continuous, Discrete and Impulsive Systems, Canada* 2005; **2**: 848-853.

[33] Gao Z, Shi X. Observer-based controller design for stochastic descriptor systems with Brownian motions. *Automatica* 2013; **49**(7): 2229-2235.

[34] Huang L, Mao X. Stability of singular stochastic systems with Markovian switching. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 2011; **56**(2): 424-429.

[35] Xia J. *Robust Control and Filter for Continuous Stochastic Time-Delay Systems*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Nanjing University of Science and Technology, China, 2007.

[36] Bellman RE. *Introduction to Matrix Analysis*. SIAM, 1995.

[37] West GR. A stochastic analysis of an input-output model. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* 1986; **54**(2): 363-374.

[38] Mao W J. An LMI approach to D-stability and D-stabilization of linear discrete singular systems with state delay. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 2011; **218**(5): 1694-1704.

[39] Wu X, Jiang L. Computer analysis algorithm for stability of the extended dynamic Leontief input-output model. *Proceedings of International Conference on Computational Intelligent and Natural Computing, Wuhan, China* 2009; **2**: 379-382.